REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of November 13, 2007 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of the specification and claims, and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

the description corresponding to paragraphs [2675], [3413], [3538], [3606] and [3831] of the present specification is amended to omit reference to the figures;

independent claim 2 is amended to specify that the second message is only sent when sending of the first message is unsuccessful;

independent claim 3 is amended to specify that the second write is sent when sending of the first attempted write is unsuccessful;

dependent claims 8-10 are cancelled;

dependent claim 16 is amended to recite --a printer controller--;

dependent claim 17 is amended to replace "second integrated circuit" with --first integrated circuit--; and

dependent claims 4-7, 15 and 18 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendment does not add any new matter to the present application as the amended features are described, for example, at paragraphs [7120]-[7236] of the present specification.

Regarding Specification Objections

It is respectfully submitted that the amendments of the specification provide the corrections required by the Examiner.

Regarding Specification Objections

It is respectfully submitted that the amendment of claim 16 provides the correction required by the Examiner.

Regarding 35 USC 112, second paragraph Rejections

Regarding Claims 2-4

It is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 2 and 3 clarify the manner in which the first and second messages/writes are sent and the manner in which they prevent sending of each other, as is described at paragraphs [7120]-[7236], in particular at paragraphs [7167]-[7171], of the present specification, and therefore clarify the recited subject matter of claims 2-4.

Regarding Claims 8-10

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the clarity rejections of claims 8-10 based on the cancellation of these claims.

Regarding Claim 17

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 17 is consistent with the recitation of claim 16.

Regarding 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a) Rejections

Response to Office Action of November 14, 2007

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claims 2 and 3, and dependent claims 4-7 and 15-18, is not disclosed or suggested by Serizawa (US 7,031,012) either taken alone or in combination with Silverbrook (US 6,217,165), for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 2 and 3 clearly recite the method of the present invention in which if a first attempted write to update a data value of a target entity is unsuccessful, then a second write to the target entity is made which prevents updating of the data value. It is also clear from the recitations of the claimed invention that if the first write is successful, such that updating of the data value occurs, then the second write is prevented.

On the other hand, the memory lock process disclosed by Serizawa is only performed once successful updating of toner values within the non-volatile memory reaches a threshold ink value, so as to prevent re-updating (see col. 6, line 1-col. 7, line 29). Thus, the process disclosed by Serizawa is clearly different than the method of the claimed invention.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's taking of Official Notice that it is apparently well known in communication systems that messages are resent when not successful, is also distinguished from the claimed invention, since in the claimed invention the second message/write does not update any data values within the target entity rather it prevents a updating write from being successful.

Furthermore, Silverbrook does not provide any disclosure which makes up for the deficiencies in Serizawa.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

D' Whip

Simon Robert Walmsley

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762